

## RESPONSE AND REMARKS

The recent telephone interview on August 17, 2004 with Examiner Jeanty is gratefully acknowledged with appreciation. A summary of the substance of the interview is included in the substance of this Response and Remarks as required by the rules. As of the date of the filing of this Response and Remarks, a copy of the Interview Summary has not yet been received.

It is noted that in order to facilitate the August 17, 2004 telephone interview, the Examiner requested, and Applicant provided, an outline of topics for discussion. The telephone interview was conducted with reference to the outline of topics, the references cited in the Office Action (namely, a Dialog entitled "A 'Blue Chip' Mailroom Investment" (referred to herein as the "Shipsystems Dialog"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,009,416 ("Pintsov")), and the specification, claims and drawings of the present application (specifically including original Claim 1 and FIG. 36a). The general nature of possible amendments to original Claim 1 was discussed during the Interview; no agreement as to specific language that would result in allowance of the Claims was reached.

Amendments to Claims 1 through 6 are filed concurrently herewith to more distinctly claim the invention; new Claims 7 through 12 have been added. Entry of the amendments and new Claims, and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

A Notice of References (FORM PTO-892) cited by the Examiner was not enclosed with the Office Action. During the Interview, Applicant requested a copy of the Notice of References (FORM PTO-892) associated with the Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Shipsystems Dialog in view of Pintsov.

The pages of the cited Shipsystems Dialog provided with the Office Action are marked as pages "1 of 3", and "2 of 3" respectively; Applicant did not receive a page marked "3 of 3." During the August 17, 2004 telephone Interview, the

Examiner confirmed that the cited Shipsystems Dialog consists of only two pages.

It is respectfully submitted that the Claims, as amended, are patentably distinguished from the cited references. First, it is respectfully submitted that, as distinguished from independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, neither the cited Shipsystems Dialog, nor Pintsov, disclose a system that is programmed to receive, or is capable of receiving, as the case may be, "from each respective user of a plurality of users a respective input of a particular respective origin postal code . . .".

As compared to being programmed to receive, or being capable of receiving, as the case may be, "from each respective user of a *plurality* of users a respective input of a particular respective origin postal code . . . " (emphasis added) as claimed by independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 (as amended), the cited Shipsystems Dialog reference discloses a system that is installed for only a single mailing entity. Specifically, the cited Shipsystems Dialog discloses that "[t]he Computerized Package Manifesting System, installed in May, 1983, enables the [Merrill Lynch Pierce Fenner & Smith Inc.] distribution center in New York to operate faster . . . ." Shipsystems Dialog, Text, paragraph 2; *see also*, Shipsystems Dialog, Abstract. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of a system, such as the Shipsystems Dialog system, that is installed for a single mailing entity, is distinguishable from, and does not disclose, anticipate or suggest, alone or in combination with any other reference, the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 (as amended) to receive/for receiving "a particular respective origin postal code" . . . "from each respective user of a *plurality* of users . . ." (emphasis added).

Similarly, new Claim 10 is distinguishable from a system, such as the Shipsystems Dialog system, that is installed for a single mailing entity. New Claim 10 is directed to receiving, via a global communications network, respective shipping specifications (a set of first item shipping specifications (new independent Claim 7); and a set of second-item shipping specifications (new Claim 10)) from respective client computers (a first client computer (new

independent Claim 7); and a second client computer (new Claim 10)). It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of a system, such as the Shipsystems Dialog system, that is installed for a single mailing entity, is distinguishable from, and does not disclose, anticipate or suggest, alone or in combination with any other reference, the subject matter of new Claim 10, that is directed to receiving, via a global communications network, respective shipping specifications from respective client computers.

Further, because the cited Shipsystems Dialog reference discloses a system that is installed for only a single mailing entity, it is respectfully submitted that the cited Shipsystems Dialog reference does not disclose, anticipate or suggest, alone or in combination with any other reference, the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, that are directed to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective origin rating zone identifier *corresponding* to the particular *respective* origin postal code . . ." (emphasis added) (that was input by "each *respective* user of a *plurality* of users" (emphasis added)).

Similar to the cited Shipsystems Dialog reference, Pintsov also discloses a system that is directed to use by a single mailer. As compared to being programmed to receive, or being capable of receiving, as the case may be, "from each respective user of a plurality of users a respective input of a particular respective origin postal code . . ." as claimed by independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 (as amended), Pintsov discloses "a mail payment and evidencing system which is adapted to be employed with a batch of mail prepared by a *mailer* . . .". Pintsov , col. 1, lines 9-12. See also, Pintsov, col. 5, lines 58-61 ("a Statement of Mailing, which may include [sic] complete set of information regarding discounts, applied by *the* mailer.") (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that Pintsov's description of a system that is directed to use by only a single mailer does not disclose, anticipate or suggest, alone or in combination with any other reference, the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, that are directed to receiving "a particular respective origin postal code" . . . "from each respective user of a *plurality* of users . . ." (emphasis added).

Further, because Pintsov discloses a system that is installed for only a single mailer, it is respectfully submitted that Pintsov does not disclose, anticipate or suggest, alone or in combination with any other reference, the subject matter of independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, that are directed to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective origin rating zone identifier *corresponding* to the particular *respective* origin postal code . . ." (emphasis added) (that was input by "each *respective* user of a *plurality* of users" (emphasis added)).

Further, it is respectfully submitted that, as distinguished from independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, which are directed to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective origin rating zone identifier . . . for each of a plurality of carriers," the Pintsov system is directed to a single carrier. See, e.g., Pintsov, col. 1, lines 10-11 (" . . . a batch of mail prepared by a *mailer* and processed by a *carrier* . . .") (emphasis added); Pintsov, col. 7, lines 21-24 ("It is digitally signed and sent to *the* verification authority . . .") (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that a system directed to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective origin rating zone identifier . . . for each of a plurality of carriers," as recited by independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, is patentably distinct from a system, such as Pintsov, that is directed to a single carrier.

Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that the recitation by new independent Claim 7 of "a first first-item carrier" and "calculat[ing] a first first-item service charge that said first first-item carrier would charge"; and the recitation by new independent Claim 7 of "a second first-item carrier" and "calculat[ing] a second first-item service charge that said second first-item carrier would charge" are patentably distinct from a system, such as Pintsov, that is directed to a single carrier.

In the Office Action, the Examiner found Pintsov's mention of a Local Area Network (Pintsov, col. 7, lines 3-9) to be equivalent to the claimed "wherein each user accesses the shipping management computer system over a global communications network using a client computer device . . .". Although the Examiner is correct that Pintsov mentions use of "a network such as LAN, WAN

or public network such as Internet. . . " (*Pintsov*, col. 7, line 7), the presently claimed invention is patentably distinct from *Pintsov*'s use of a network.

*Pintsov*'s brief mention of LAN, WAN and the Internet relates to the transmission of a "statement of discount" that is produced "*at the end of address processing activity . . . to a computing device in a mail production facility.*"

*Pintsov*, col. 7, lines 3-6 (emphasis added). *Pintsov*'s statement of discounts is prepared by a "secure trusted accounting device" ("STAD") "upon completion of a mailing." See *Pintsov*, col. 5, lines 47-63.

It is respectfully submitted that a system "wherein each respective user accesses the shipping management computer system over a global communications network using a respective user client computer device" as recited by independent Claims 1, 3 and 5, as amended, is patentably distinct from, and is not disclosed, anticipated or suggested, alone or in combination with any other reference, by *Pintsov*'s brief mention of a LAN, WAN and the Internet for transmission of a "statement of discount" that is produced "*at the end of address processing activity . . . to a computing device in a mail production facility*" (emphasis added).

Further, independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 (as amended) are directed to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective origin rating zone identifier *corresponding* to the particular respective origin postal code . . ." (emphasis added) that was input by a *respective* user of a plurality of users; and to determine/determining "a carrier-specific respective destination rating zone identifier *corresponding* to the particular respective destination postal code . . ." that was also input by the *respective* user. The cited references, alone or in combination with any other reference, do not disclose, anticipate or suggest the claimed determination of carrier-specific origin and destination rating zone identifiers that correspond to a particular origin postal code and destination postal code, respectively, that were input by one user of a plurality of users.

Moreover, the cited references, alone or in combination with any other reference, do not disclose, anticipate or suggest, as claimed in Claims 1, 3 and 5, the determination "for each respective input by each respective user of a

particular respective origin postal code . . . and . . . destination postal code . . ."  
of carrier-specific origin and destination rating zone identifiers that correspond to  
the particular respective origin and destination postal codes.

It is respectfully submitted that new independent Claim 7 is similarly  
patentably distinct from, and is not disclosed, anticipated or suggested, alone or  
in combination with any other reference, by Pintsov's brief mention of a LAN,  
WAN and the Internet for transmission of a "statement of discount" that is  
produced "*at the end of address processing activity* . . . to a computing device in  
a mail production facility" (emphasis added).

As recited in new independent Claim 7, the claimed "shipping  
management computer system is configured for . . . receiving, from a first client  
computer that is connected to communicate with said shipping management  
computer system via a global communications network . . . a set of first-item  
shipping specifications . . .". Further, as recited in new independent Claim 7, the  
claimed "shipping management computer system is configured for . . . identifying  
a first first-item carrier . . . in accordance with said first-item shipping  
specifications . . . [and for] . . . identifying a second first-item carrier . . . in  
accordance with said first set of shipping specifications. . .".

It is respectfully submitted that a system that is configured, as claimed in  
new independent Claim 7, for "receiving, from a first client computer that is  
connected to communicate with said . . . system via a global communications  
network, a set of first-item shipping specifications . . .", and for "identifying a first  
first-item carrier . . . in accordance with said first-item shipping specifications . . .  
[and for] . . . identifying a second first-item carrier . . . in accordance with said  
first set of shipping specifications. . ." is patentably distinct from, and is not  
disclosed, anticipated or suggested, alone or in combination with any other  
reference, by Pintsov's brief mention of a LAN, WAN and the Internet for  
transmission of a "statement of discount" that is produced "*at the end of address  
processing activity* . . . to a computing device in a mail production facility"  
(emphasis added).

For the foregoing reasons, because independent Claims 1, 3, and 5 (as amended), and new independent Claim 7, are patentable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 through 12 are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in the present amended application is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the amended application.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By   
Marilyn R. Khorsandi  
Reg. No. 45,744  
626/796-2856